PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number: STL920000034US1
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the EFS-Web System to the USPTO on: February 20, 2009 Signature: /David Victor/ Typed or Printed Name: David W. Victor	**Application Number:** 09/579,864	**Filed:** May 25, 2000
	First Named Inventor: B.C. HAWKS et al.	
	Art Unit: 2445	**Examiner:** Adnan M. Mirza

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached four (4) sheet(s).
Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the:

☐ applicant/inventor

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)

☒ attorney or agent of record.
Registration Number Registration No. 39,867

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34

/David Victor/
Signature

David W. Victor
Typed or Printed Name

(310) 553-7977
Telephone Number

February 20, 2009
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required*.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s):	B.C. HAWKS et al.	Examiner	Adnan M. Mirza
Serial No.	09/579,864	Group Art Unit	2445
Filed	May 25, 2000	Docket No.	STL920000034US1
TITLE	METHOD OF, SYSTEM FOR, AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR PROVIDING A DATA STRUCTURE FOR CONFIGURING CONNECTIONS BETWEEN A LOCAL WORKSTATION FILE SYSTEM AND A REMOTE HOST FILE SYSTEM		

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW ARGUMENTS

Applicants request review of the rejection of claims 1, 9-14, and 22-24 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Stedman (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,837), Imai (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,334), and Buckley (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,327) in the Final Office Action dated October 20, 2008 ("FOA").

Claim 1: With respect to claim 1, Applicants request review of the Examiner's citation to Stedman as disclosing various claim requirements (FOA, pg. 3). The Code of Federal Regulations requires that "the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified", 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2); MPEP Sec. 707. The Examiner's citation to Stedman does not comply with this requirement because the Examiner did not cite any specific section of Stedman as teaching the claim requirements.

With respect to claim 1, Applicants request review of the Examiner findings that col. 15, lines 44-54, col. 2, lines 55-63, and col. 19, lines 61-66 of Imai (FOA, pgs. 3, 8) teaches the claimed local system data structure, host system data structure, and mapping data structure as comprising tags in a metalanguage format forming a file system connection descriptor to support remote editing of files in the host file system from the local file system.

The cited col. 15 mentions that the URL of a requested file is in a form enclosed by a special tag. When the file requesting client requests the requested file and the file is received from the file server, the requested file is displayed at the viewer of the file requesting client. The viewer also detects the URL of the file enclosed by the special tag. The cited col. 2 mentions providing a file transfer method to limit a number of files when a file transfer is not fast enough or storage capacity is insufficient or when a file display is limited. The cited col. 19 mentions that when using a viewer that utilizes a modified HTTP, the negotiation unit can check

whether the viewer is compatible with the file acquisition procedure by checking whether the viewer is using modified HTTP or not.

The cited cols. 2, 15, and 19 of Imai do not teach or suggest tags in a metalanguage format for a local system data structure, a host system data structure, a mapping data structure, and a transfer type. Instead, the cited cols. 2 and 15 discuss how a URL may be in a special tag and how to provide a file transfer method under certain conditions, such as when a file transfer is not fast enough, or available storage capacity is insufficient. Further, the cited col. 19 discusses a check that may be made as to whether the viewer is compatible with the acquired file. Nowhere does the cited discussion in Imai teach or suggest the claim requirements of a local file system data structure representing a local file system, a host file system data structure representing a host file system, and a mapping data structure between files in the local file system and files in the host file system, and a transfer type, where all these data structures comprise tags in a metalanguage format that form a file system connection descriptor. Instead, the cited Imai mentions that a URL is in a special tag, and how a requested file is displayed at the viewer of the requesting client. The cited URL in a tag does not teach tags for a local system data structure, host system data structure, and mapping as claimed.

Further, even if one were to combine the cited Imai with the other references, the cited combination does not teach the claim requirements concerning a local file system data structure, a host file system data structure, and a mapping data structure comprising tags in a meta language format as claimed. The cited Imai provides special tags for a URL of a file, not a local file system, host file system, and mapping data structures as claimed.

Applicants further request review of the Examiner's findings that col. 19, lines 1-16 and steps 252, 258, and 250 of Buckley teach the claim 1 requirement to support remote editing of files in the host file system from the local file system, wherein the tags are in a metalanguage format, and wherein each tag has an identifier and a set of one or more attributes and wherein the encoded local system data structure, host system data structure, and mapping data structure forms a file system connection descriptor. (FOA, pg. 4).

The cited Buckley mentions an encoder to encode additional data that will be sent to a server. Step 250 emits into the encoded data stream properties. The number of properties is represented as a DWORD. At step 252, the property tag for the next property line is emitted,

where a property tag code has an identifier for the property name and a property tag code that identifies a property data type.

Nowhere does the cited Buckley teach or suggest the claimed remote editing of files in a host file system from a local file system or teach tags in a metalanguage format encoded in a local system, data structure, host system data structure and mapping data structure that forms a file system connection descriptor used for such remote editing. The cited Buckley mentions encoding properties into a data stream, such as a property name and a property tag code. However, there is not teaching or suggestion in the cited Buckley that the encoded properties comprise tags in a metalanguage format and that an encoded local, host, and mapping data structures form a file system connection descriptor used to access the host file to support remote editing as claimed. Instead, the cited col. 19 discusses encoding a property tag into a data stream, not the specific details of encoding host, local and mapping data structures as claimed.

Thus, the cited Stedman, Imai and Buckley even when combined do not teach or suggest the claim requirements of a local system data structure, host system data structure, and mapping data structure as comprising tags in a metalanguage format forming a file system connection descriptor to support remote editing of files in the host file system from the local file system. Further, the Examiner has not cited any part of the art that teaches or suggests that the mapping data structure has a transfer type that defines a data format fro transferring data between the host system and local system to support remote editing.

Claim 9: Applicants request review of the Examiner's finding that col. 19, lines 1-15 of Buckley teaches the requirements of claim 9, which depends from claim 1, of a host file pattern data structure storing a pattern describing a host file to which the local file extension will be applied. (FOA, pg. 7)

The cited Buckley mentions an encoder to encode additional data that will be sent to a server. Step 250 emits properties into the encoded data stream. The number of properties is represented as a DWORD. At step 252, the property tag for the next property line is emitted, where a property tag code has an identifier for the property name and a property tag code that identifies a property data type.

Nowhere does the cited Buckley teach or suggest the claim requirements of a host file pattern data structure storing a pattern describing a host file to which the local file extension will be applied. Instead, the cited col. 22 discusses encoding a property in a data stream.

Claim 10: Applicants request review of the Examiner's finding that col. 27, lines 23-35 of Imai teaches the requirements of claim 10, which depends from 9, that the mapping data structure further comprises a host codepage data structure storing an identification of a host codepage in which data in the host file is encoded and a local-codepage data structure storing an identification of a local codepage in which data in a local file is encoded. (FOA, pg. 7).

The cited col. 27 mentions transferring only those files selected according to the file type to prevent waste due to the transfer of files that cannot be utilized at the file requesting client. In a third example, the multiple files transfer request unit is for transferring only those files which match the transfer condition provided in the file requesting client. Nowhere does this cited col. 27 anywhere teach or suggest a mapping data structure further including a host codepage data structure storing an identification of a host codepage in which data in the host file is encoded and a local-codepage data structure storing an identification of a local codepage in which data in a local file is encoded. Nowhere is there any mention or suggestion of host and local codepages as claimed.

Applicants further request review of the rejection because the Examiner provided no grounds for rejection pending claims 22-24. Applicants note that the Examiner did not include these claims in the rejection although the Examiner recognized the pendency of these claims in the Office Action dated March 19, 2008, and these claims were not canceled by Applicant in any intervening paper. Accordingly, the rejection in the Final Office action is improper for not providing grounds of rejection with respect to claims 22-24.

Dated: February 20, 2009

By: /David Victor/
David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984